

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

DOI: 10.15838/esc.2024.4.94.3

UDC 330.8, LBC 65.01

© Volchik V.V., Maslyukova E.V.

Leading Russian Economists on Ideology in Economic Science



Vyacheslav V.

VOLCHIK

Southern Federal University

Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

e-mail: volchik@sfedu.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-0027-3442; ResearcherID: K-7832-2012



Elena V.

MASLYUKOVA

Southern Federal University

Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

e-mail: maslyukova@sfedu.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-9918-3040; ResearcherID: K-7143-2016

Abstract. The article considers the role of ideological component in the works of leading Russian economists. In this paper the mutual influence of ideology and economic theory is considered. Addressing ideology explicitly is important in order to be able to track how ideological processes in economic science itself influence our lives through ways of thinking and politics. The analysis of the use of the concept of “ideology” by leading Russian economists is conducted. With the help of quantitative content analysis of the formed base of scientific articles of 21 leading Russian economists, a categorical grid (dictionary) of content analysis, including 406 word-combinations, was formed. To identify key microthemes, factor analysis (principal component analysis) was used; as a result, nine thematic groups were identified based on the interpretation of the obtained factor loads of the principal components: relationship of ideology with the formation of world economic patterns in the context of the formation of a new configuration of the global economy; relationship of market mechanisms and economic development; economic reproduction, state planning and control; global dominance and hegemony

For citation: Volchik V.V., Maslyukova E.V. (2024). Leading Russian economists on ideology in economic science. *Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 17(4), 58–74. DOI: 10.15838/esc.2024.4.94.3

of the United States; state regulation with an emphasis on issues of entrepreneurship and capital reproduction and public interests; liberal globalization in the context of international cooperation and social responsibility; administrative reform, regulation and executive power of the Russian Federation; development of information technologies and information economy in the context of meeting needs, decision-making and organization of production and regional and spatial development of Russia. The analysis of microthemes from texts of leading Russian economists, using in explicit form the concept of ideology, allows showing the influence of the ideological component on positive and normative aspects of research within the framework of Russian economic science.

Key words: ideology, economic theory, economic ideology, methodology of economic science, factor analysis, leading Russian economists.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the grant of Russian Science Foundation No. 24-18-00665, <https://rscf.ru/en/project/24-18-00665/> “Ideological landscape of Russian economic science” at Southern Federal University.

Introduction

If one opens a popular textbook on micro- or macroeconomics, one can quite often find the words that economic science is rather a positive science, studies objective economic processes, uses advanced analytical methods, and through its theories provides insight into the workings of the economic system. In such textbooks the reader is unlikely to find mention of ideology and its influence on theories and models. However, the role of ideologies remains quite significant for the development of economic science. And in modern textbooks and scientific articles the role of ideological component is significant, although in the vast majority of cases this component is presented in an implicit form.

The aim of the study is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the ideological component of post-Soviet Russian economic science on the basis of the works of leading Russian economists. Novelty of the work lies in raising the question of how leading Russian economists explicitly address the problem of ideologies.

In Soviet times, within the framework of Marxist political economy, the ideological component was

obvious. The collapse of the Soviet social order led to a very rapid transformation of economic science, as well as other social sciences. This transformation was carried out in line with economic mainstream, which implies the borrowing of theories, scientific tools and methodology. At the very beginning, this was expressed in translating foreign textbooks and organizing scientific research according to “world best practices”. Officially, the role of ideology in economic science was either denied altogether or considered unimportant.

In the Russian history of market reforms the negative attitude toward the ideological component of economic science, first of all to the Marxist ideological dominance in the Soviet economic science, was a very important point. Such ideologized understanding of economic theories and economic policy was opposed to the scientific understanding, based on analyzing “objective reality” using scientific methods and procedures. Very indicative in this respect are the words of Larisa Piyasheva, who in 1987 published a small article “Where the pies are lush”, which had a significant influence among the intellectuals of the

time. Promoting the idea of the need for market reforms, Larisa Piyasheva ends her paper with a very interesting statement: “The second remark about the possible question of where the author’s ideological sympathies lie: the plan or the market. For those interested I would like to remind Engels’ famous words that a man of science should not have ideals, because the presence of ideals means bias, prevents seeing reality as it is”¹. In fact, appealing to the scientificity of “real market economy” and its freedom from ideology, L. Piyasheva expressed a Marxist idea of ideology as “false consciousness”.

The replacement of Marxist political economy with modern economic disciplines in the educational process, of course, had many progressive aspects. However, it is necessary to declare that the very fact of such replacement was connected with the defeat of one ideology – Marxist and the victory of another – primarily neoliberal. And neoliberal ideological attitudes in the construction of the Russian market economic order led to the results, which economists, who were directly involved in the reforms, called the construction of a “normal country” with an economy corresponding to market countries with a similar level of per capita national income (Shleifer, Treisman, 2004). We should note that theoretical substantiation of neoliberal reforms was based on explicit denial of ideological engagement, but implicitly the ideological component of such reforms was very significant.

Another telling example, illustrating an explicit declaration of rejection of ideology, is given by Academician V. Polterovich in his review of a book by J. Kornai: “The negative experience of immersion in Marxist ideology did not force János to turn to the other extreme – “market radicalism”. This experience made him reject ideology in scientific research” (Polterovich, 2008, p. 132). And this

approach to ideology was quite often declared by post-Soviet economists to emphasize an important idea: unlike the ideologized Soviet political economy, we have become engaged in economic science that investigates objective processes with the help of scientific methods and theories recognized by the scientific community around the world. Indeed, there is logic in such declarations, but there are also omissions associated with the idealization of “modern world economic science” as free from ideological influence. Ideology is deliberately placed outside the framework of science proper. However, modern scientific literature notes that the fact that economic theory uses advanced mathematical models, following the example of natural sciences, does not make the discipline immune to ideological bias (Javdani, Chang, 2023, p. 312). Here we can also cite the words of V.M. Polterovich regarding the role and importance of ideology in terms of philosophical foundations of science: “The complexity of social systems, their variability and the impossibility (except for rare situations) of conducting laboratory experiments lead to the fact that general concepts claiming to explain reality and practical significance have to rely on ideology. Ideology binds “scientifically established” facts together, organizing them into a coherent whole that represents a philosophical understanding of the problems at hand. The greater the number of such facts that can be united within a particular ideological attitude, the more credible are the assumptions that actually underlie it. Philosophy thus plays the role of a bridge between ideology and science” (Polterovich, 2017, p. 57).

Explicitly focusing on ideological moments in modern economic theory is necessary for deliberative processes within science itself. If we deny the presence of ideology, the subject of deliberation disappears, but the implicit ideological preferences of economists in their theories and discourses still remain and continue to influence politics

¹ L. Piyasheva published this article under a pseudonym. Popkova L. (1987). Where the pies are lush. *Novy mir*, 5, 239–241.

and education. Therefore, ideology matters for economic science, even if economists (mostly mainstream) deny its influence on the theory and methodology of “real science”. However, this significance is understood differently both in Western and Russian economic science.

In relation to economic science in the context of ideology, there are three lines for analysis: first, the role of ideology in the development of economic science itself; second, the influence of economic theories on the formation of ideas and ideologies used by politicians through narratives widely spread in public discourse; third, the influence of ideological proto-narratives (containing simplified proto-models) directly on economic processes, reforms and development. All of these lines may overlap, but addressing the issue of ideology explicitly is important so that it is possible to trace how ideological processes in economic science itself affect our lives through ways of thinking and policy.

Theory and ideology in economic science

Discussions in economic science seldom rely explicitly on the mention of ideology and rather distance themselves from any ideological connotation, appealing to scientific objectivity instead. However, the history of economic thought contains quite a few examples when one or another significant research became a consequence of political battles.

Economic history provides many examples of what is related to the influence of ideology on specific economic processes and policies. For example, D. North notes that basic Marxist ideological models regarding private property did not allow the experiment of new economic policy to last long and led to the dominance of planned economy. However, even dogmatic adherence to Marxist ideology did not prevent the USSR from achieving superpower status in the 1960s–1970s (North, 2010, pp. 16–17). There are also other examples where ideological factors positively

influenced the development of reform strategies and their implementation. For instance, in China during the market reforms of the 1980s and 1990s, it was the successful combination of Marxist ideology and market theories that allowed building an efficient socialist market economy and avoiding “shock therapy” and related shocks (Weber, 2021).

At present, the main problem arises from the fact that ideological attitudes are not explicitly voiced, but are used implicitly or in terms of eclectic borrowing of elements from many ideological doctrines of the past. In addition to eclecticism in the modern information society, explicit or implicit import of ideological attitudes is inevitable. And such import can be associated with the emergence of beliefs and ways of thinking that poorly correspond to the socio-economic reality of a historically and institutionally specific economic order. Imported ideology thus becomes an important factor in international politics and in the use of soft power.

For a long time ideologies in the system of capitalism were used to justify the existing status quo, including an issue such as inequality, and thus helped stabilize society (Piketty, 2020; Yan, 2022). Ideological narratives through the works of economists serve to justify reforms by using ideologically colored official explanations of the reasons for the achievements or poor results of these policies (Makarov et al., 2019, p. 64).

In his famous 1990 paper, Douglas North showed that ideology significantly influences human choices through various institutions and institutional structures (North, 1990). In his extended definition of ideology, North focuses on the subjective perception of individuals as to how the world should be organized: “By ideology I mean the subjective perceptions (models, theories) all people possess to explain the world around them. Whether at the microlevel of individual relationships or at the macrolevel of organized ideologies providing integrated explanations of the past and the present,

such as communism or religions, the theories individuals construct are colored by normative views of how the world should be organized” (North, 1997, p. 41).

The definition of ideology given in the Encyclopedia of Philosophy is almost all-encompassing: “Ideology is a system of conceptualized perceptions and ideas that expresses the interests, world-view and ideals of various subjects of politics – classes, nations, society, political parties, social movements – and acts as a form of sanctioning either the existing domination and power in society (conservative ideologies) or their radical transformation (ideologies of the “left” and “right” movements). Ideology and the form of social consciousness is a component of culture and spiritual production”². This definition is quite often used by economists as a basic one (Kirdina-Chandler, 2022; Leksin, 2023).

In order to understand and operationalize ideology in relation to economic science, it is necessary to clearly define what can be considered ideology in economic science. For this purpose, let us turn to another definition of ideology by D. North: “Ideologies are shared frameworks of mental models that groups of individuals possess that provide both an interpretation of the environment and a prescription as to how that environment should be ordered” (North, 1994, p. 363). There are three very important concepts in this definition: first, they are mental models; second, these mental models exist and circulate in groups of individuals (for economic science, such groups are scientific schools and associations of scientists); third, mental models are used to produce positive and normative knowledge about the subject of research (in the case of economic science). This definition of ideology in relation

to the community of economists and academic science is very close, for example, to T. Piketty’s interpretation of ideology: “I use “ideology” in a positive and constructive sense to refer to a set of a priori plausible ideas and discourses describing how society should be structured. An ideology has social, economic, and political dimensions. It is an attempt to respond to a broad set of questions concerning the desirable or ideal organization of society.” (Piketty, 2020, pp. 10–11). Therefore, when we talk about ideology in economic science, we first of all pay attention to the “mental models” or “plausible ideas and discourses” that economic scientists use to obtain positive and normative knowledge about economic processes and orders.

For an ideology to be effective, it is critical that its dissemination be associated with an increasing returns effect. If increasing returns are understood as a class of social interactions with a positive feedback loop that allow for the benefits of scaling up (Volchik, 2022), then the spread of ideology is also associated with benefits for individuals. One of the most important benefits in this case relates to the predictability of other actors’ behavior when a “morality of cooperation” emerges (North, 1997, p. 64; Sugden, 1986).

Increasing returns in the dissemination of certain ideological attitudes lead to the lock-in effect (Arthur, 1989). Lock-in occurs when switching to alternative ideological currents becomes too costly from a collective action perspective. Therefore, an ideology, even if it leads to negative economic and social consequences, is not rejected and replaced by a more progressive one precisely because of the path dependence or institutional trap that blocks alternatives (Balatsky, 2020).

The evolution of ideology is related to the formation of cognitive processes in organized groups of actors. Such processes, besides being evolutionary, are closely related to value attitudes, cultural codes and traditions. V.A. Volkonsky’s

² Semigin G. Yu. (2010). Ideology. In: *New Philosophical Encyclopedia: In 4 volumes. Volume 2*. Moscow: Mysl. P. 81.

approach to the study of ideology connects the evolution of ideas as mental models with social values dominant in a particular national culture: “Ideology is a system of ideas about the world and value-based and semantic paradigms that dominates in a certain community, promoting and directing the life of its members” (Volkonsky, 2024, p. 44).

In economic science, researchers remain wary of ideology. And this has a rather simple explanation based on a simple scheme of the structure of economic science. This structure includes three elements depending on what economic science studies – positive economics is the study of what is, normative economics is the study of what should be, and the art of economics is “the study of how to achieve the goals specified in normative economics, given what we have learned in the science of economics” (Colander, 2013, pp. 245–246). The last two components, normative economics and the art of economics, which relate to economic policy, are most often attributed to ideology. It is this explicit connection to normative judgments, justification and design of economic policy that has a meaningful ideological impact.

However, it can be argued that positive economic theory is also subject to ideological influence, although more often in an implicit form: “It is now widely recognized that the main way in which ideology penetrates economic theory is through the fundamental paradigm or cognitive system that provides a common framework for thinking and which, although loaded with metaphysical content and psychological conditioning, is a key property of ideology” (Samuels, 1992). Therefore, the choice of a fundamental paradigm as a starting point for conducting research can also be considered to be subject to ideological influence.

The fundamental paradigm is shaped and changed by the works created by the leaders of

scientific schools. In the history of economic thought, it is quite common to observe a situation when major economists, founders of scientific schools, actually deny the ideological component in “truly scientific” positive economics. Such economists who emphasized a de-ideologized positive economic science were Karl Marx, Ludwig Mises and Milton Friedman. However, the denial of an ideological component in positive economics fails to take into account the fact that theoretical and epistemological assumptions can, at the stage of forming basic fundamental concepts and theoretical frameworks, carry significant ideological potential (Badiei, 2024). It is no coincidence that Marxist political economy and the Austrian School are perceived in the history of economic thought and in public discourse as scientific foundations of major ideologies of the 20th century.

Ideological neutrality, which is often emphasized in modern economic theory, in particular, is ensured by the use of various kinds of mathematical methods and statistical analytics. Such abundant use of complex mathematical tools should and does create the impression that economists, like representatives of natural sciences, study objective and well-measured phenomena and processes of economic life. However, as Nobel laureate P. Romer noted, the phenomenon to which he coined a special term – mathiness (excessive use of mathematics) – has become more and more widespread. Using the concept of “excessive use of mathematics”, P. Romer drew attention to a rather frequent phenomenon in economic science, when sophisticated mathematical methods are used not to solve a specific scientific problem, but only to mask ideological engagement or empty theorizing that has nothing to do with the observed economic processes (Romer, 2015).

The widespread use of game theory in areas of economic science such as public choice theory, for example, allows for the promotion of a cont-

ractical approach to explain social arrangements. But such explanations may also contain hidden ideological attitudes to justify the actions of government and dominant elites or special interest groups with the power to impose their own rules. Such rules are “legitimized” through scientific theories despite serving to advance the elites’ own interests, often at the expense of the interests of the general public (Holcombe et al., 2021).

To understand the influence of ideology on economic science, it is important to consider the historical patterns of ideology’s penetration into the epistemological foundations of economic theories. A good example of ideological epistemological foundations is provided by the case of rational choice theory: “At one level, the notion of systems analysis seems anything but ideological. However, its roots lay in rational choice theory, which arguably had an ideological use, since it provided an intellectual framework for opposing communism. The rational individual agent could be contrasted with the collective actions of the Soviet state” (Backhouse, 2010, p. 145). In the post-Soviet period of development of Russian economic science, initially the tendency of sometimes uncritical importation of the theoretical corpus of the mainstream as a model of a truly scientific approach to the study of economics clearly dominated.

Modern Russian economic science remains wary of ideology. In the 1990s the Marxist-Leninist past of Russian social sciences formed a negative attitude toward ideologization of science. A kind of institutional inertia in terms of negative perception of ideological influence continues to have a significant impact in the academic community of economists.

Insights in the implications of economic reforms sparked researchers’ interest in studying the influence of ideologies on the development of Russian economic science. And here we should note that the normative aspects of economic theory in

the study and comprehension of the influence of ideologies came to the forefront.

In social sciences, the boundaries of science and ideology are blurred. If we consider science and ideology as opposite concepts, then any movement toward “ideologization” is detrimental to science. Such a radical approach gives an oversimplified understanding of the complex processes of evolution of scientific paradigms and their ideological components. Sociology of science repeatedly notes: “The boundaries of science are ambiguous, flexible, historically changing, contextually variable, internally inconsistent, and sometimes disputed... Descriptions of science as distinctively truthful, useful, objective or rational may best be analyzed as ideologies: incomplete and ambiguous images of science nevertheless useful for scientists’ pursuit of authority and material resources” (Gieryn, 1983, pp. 792–793). Therefore, explicitly addressing ideology in economic science does not signify a movement from scientism to politicization, but emphasizes the importance of identifying dominant fundamental paradigms that have a significant impact on the theory and design of economic policy measures. Recognition of the relevance of studying ideologies in economic science is based on the understanding that the very choice of the research subject, background, methods and assumptions largely depends on the ideological attitudes of a scientific school (Gulbina, Artibyakina, 2015, p. 38).

What do economists get from the inclusion of ideology in the explicit form in the subject field of research? Why is the denial of the scientificity of ideology so ingrained among economists? The responds to these questions lie in the philosophical and epistemological foundations of social sciences. The very denial of ideological nature of economics has clear ideological overtones that often resemble peculiar beliefs: “Cynicism is also a form of ideology. Saying you are a pragmatist is a very strong

form of ideology. And these businesspeople have their own ideology, but they don't talk about it. It is similar to economics: it has values, but one doesn't talk about them, one doesn't discuss them, one just believes in them. In economics we use a lot of math, a lot of business jargon, a lot of McKinsey, etc., and by doing so we hide a truly religious nature" (Sedlacek, 2017, p. 255).

The use of ideologically non-neutral approaches leads to various kinds of distortions in understanding the goals and possibilities of economic development. V.N. Leksin gives an interesting example. Analyzing the Spatial Development Strategy of the Russian Federation for the period until 2025, he shows what conceptual and ideological foundation its designing was based on. Applying such ideology for this strategy and similar documents "always marked the victory of one or another lobbying of certain interests, most often united only by a common liberal-market ideology" (Leksin, 2019, p. 13).

There are examples when in economic science the presence of ideology is not silenced, but, on the contrary, becomes an important component in the development of the scientific discipline. The development of Marxist political economy in the USSR can serve as such an example. S.G. Kirdina noted: "The peculiarity of Russian economic thought, represented in the political economy of socialism, is the consideration of society as a unity of economy, politics and ideology" (Kirdina, 2006, p. 26). Although ideological attitudes did not allow Marxist political economy to integrate sufficiently with major currents of contemporary economic science, it represented an original way of conceptualizing institutional features of evolution of the socialist economy. Moreover, Marxist political economy reflected in its development the main features of the type of institutional matrix of the Soviet and then Russian society (Kirdina, 2006).

Undoubtedly, the uncreative use of ideological clichés in the development of any science, and

economic science in particular, negatively affects the freedom of creativity and scientific search. Thus, the example of the Soviet period of development of Marxist political economy proves that under the influence of ideological restrictions, scientific discussions led to a "cognitive deadlock" (Nureev, Orekhovsky, 2021).

We should note that in Soviet conditions the ideological component of scientific activity (especially in social sciences) was always openly declared. In Soviet society, the ideological function of, for example, political economy had a systems character. The ideological task of justifying the superiority of socialist economic system over capitalism was solved first of all (Demicheva, 2008, p. 209). During market reforms in post-Soviet Russia, the ideological function of economic theory lost its significance. Moreover, following the dominant idea of neoclassicism about the positive nature of economic theory, ideology as such was left out of economic science. However, in fact, there was a latent replacement of one ideology by another, which was not advertised; nevertheless, it had a significant impact on the formation of economists' worldview.

The inclusion of ideology in the subject of study of theoretical economists requires significant historical insights and references to scientific discussions, which could clarify the evolution and place of ideology in economic science. It is also necessary, apparently, to recognize that it is hardly possible to completely eliminate the influence of ideology on economic studies (especially those related to inequality, labor market regulation, and property distribution).

Analysis of the use of the concept "ideology" by leading Russian economists

The works of leading economists are of great importance for dissemination of a particular ideology. To trace how and in what context the Russian economists leading by bibliometric

Table 1. Leading Russian economists mentioning the term “ideology”

	Economist	Number of articles that mention “ideology”
1	S.Yu. Glazyev	47
2	V.N. Leksin	16
3	V.M. Polterovich	10
4	G.B. Kleiner	9
5	P.A. Minakir	7
6	A.N. Shvetsov	6
7	A.N. Asaul	5
8	V.A. Mau	5
9	R.I. Kapelyushnikov	4
10	V.Ya. Tsvetkov	4
11	A.A. Yakovlev	4
12	V.L. Makarov	3
13	Yu.V. Yakovets	3
14	A.I. Orlov	3
15	M.V. Melnik	2
16	M.V. Fedorov	2
17	A.E. Shastitko	2
18	E.M. Akhmetshin	1
19	A.M. Batkovsky	1
20	E.T. Gurvich	1
21	A.L. Kudrin	1

Source: own compilation.

indicators use the concept of ideology, we turned to a rating compiled by M. Sokolov and E. Chechik (Sokolov, Chechik, 2022). In their study, they cite three top-20 rankings according to Elibrary, RSCI core, and RSCI scientometric indicators. We combined these three rankings, and, having eliminated repetitions, produced the final list containing 42 economists. Through the search of scientific electronic library Elibrary.ru we determined which of the 42 economists used the concept “ideology” explicitly in all morphological forms. Search parameters: in the title of the publication, in the abstract, in the full text of the publication, in the keywords, journal articles, and books. As a result, it was found that out of 42 economists, 21 mentioned ideology explicitly (Tab. 1) and 21 did not.

Further, using the Lekta computer program, we created a dictionary (categorical grid) for the

subsequent identification of semantic chains of selected lexemes related to the common subject field. Thus, as a result of the analysis it was revealed that the term “ideology” was mentioned in the analyzed works of economists 1,006 times, “ideological” – 382 times, “ideologist” – 35 times, “ideologeme” – 10 times, “ideologization” – 9 times. S.Yu. Glazyev uses the lexeme “ideology” most often, compared to other leading economists from the sample. In order to compile the categorical grid, we used word combinations, rather than individual words (lexemes), for better interpretation of the obtained factors. As a result of the analysis 406 word combinations were included in the categorical grid. All the selected word combinations were ranked by frequency of occurrence in the texts of the articles selected for analysis. Table 2 shows the 30 most popular word combinations found in the works of leading Russian economists.

Table 2. Top 30 word combinations found in the works of leading Russian economists

Word combination	Frequency
World economic paradigm	527
Economic theory	273
Elite in power	259
Russian language	258
Economic growth	226
Technological paradigm	213
Economic policy	208
Population of Russia	203
Economic science	202
Economic system	193
Socio-economic development	178
Industrial relations	176
Development of the economy	166
Management system	164
World War	156
World economy	154
Russian economy	153
Economic development	148
Russian state	133
Productive forces	116
Russian civilization	110
World project	104
Economic space	104
European countries	101
Development of Russia	99
Executive power	98
Economic activity	94
Spatial development	90
Constituent entities of the Russian Federation	90
Source: own compilation.	

Further, we used factor analysis (principal component analysis), which allows us to identify the main microthemes (thematic blocks) in the articles of Russian economists by interpreting the matrix of factor loadings (coefficients that show the degree to which each word combination affects the given factor) (*Tab. 3*). For the analysis each factor includes only those word combinations, the values of factor loadings of which exceed modulo 0.3. Factors are extracted in descending order of their influence on the total variance.

To illustrate the microthemes highlighted in the course of factor analysis, let us give extended quotations from the publications of leading Russian economists.

The first main component is related to the relationship between ideology and the formation of world economic paradigms in the context of building a new configuration of the global economy. In terms of the ideological component of the new world economic paradigms, the ideology of Eurasianism has the greatest influence: “The

Table 3: Factor loadings

No.	Factor loadings of codes
Factor 1	Productive forces Production relations World economic paradigm Global economy Economic order International relations System of institutions
Factor 2	Development management Development of the economy Market mechanisms Management effectiveness Production growth People's welfare
Factor 3	State planning Reproduction parameters State control Reproduction of the economy Personal responsibility
Factor 4	American cycle Accumulation cycle Global dominance US hegemony Capital accumulation Production of goods
Factor 5	Economic regulation Entrepreneurial activity Public interest Reproduction of capital State regulation Reproduction parameters
Factor 6	Financial and economic relations Social responsibility International cooperation Liberal globalization Nation States Private capital Social policy
Factor 7	Executive branch Administrative reform Federal agencies State services President of Russia
Factor 8	Information technology Decision making Information economics Production organization People's needs Satisfaction of needs
Factor 9	Socio-economic development Development of Russia Spatial development Constituent entities of the Russian Federation Regional development
Source: own compilation.	

ideology of Eurasianism allows us to concretize the way in which the ‘community of the single destiny of humankind’ is formed”. This implies creating a coalition of countries focused on building a new world economic paradigm, excluding confrontation and the use of military force in international relations, respecting the national interests and characteristics of all countries. Their relations are based on mutually beneficial voluntary cooperation and strict compliance with the norms and principles of international law. At the same time, it is important to add that we have called the new world economic paradigm integral, since the main function of the state becomes the harmonization of the interests of all social groups for the sake of achieving a common goal – increasing people’s welfare” (Glazyev, 2023, p. 74).

The second main component reflects the relationship between market mechanisms and development of the economy. In this regard, the works of economists present an understanding of the limitations of mechanistic and neoliberal approaches to analyzing the development of market mechanisms: “And surprisingly, the theory and practice of modern management, which are taught in management schools, goes against the basic economic theory of market equilibrium. This is because this theory cannot be used to manage the economy. It carries a purely ideological load. The ideological function that this theory provides and the philosophy that fuels the ideology of radical liberalism consist in a simple thing: the state should not interfere in the economy” (Glazyev, 2014, p. 63).

The third microtheme considers economic reproduction, state planning and control. In the sample, the agenda related to ideology in the economy is most widespread in the works of S.Yu. Glazyev. They reflect that the use of market and planned mechanisms in the economy should depend on the specific features and historical

path of specific economic orders: “All countries (from Vietnam to Ethiopia), following the path of formation of a convergent model, combining socialist ideology and state planning with market mechanisms and private entrepreneurship (regulating the latter in order to increase the production of material goods), demonstrate advanced and stable development against the background of stagnation of the leading capitalist economies. The American century-long cycle of capital accumulation is being replaced by the Asian one, and the center of the world economy is shifting toward Southeast Asia” (Glazyev, 2020, p. 19).

The next topic discussed in the articles of leading Russian economists is devoted to the problem of global dominance and hegemony of the United States. The configuration of the global economy is changing due to the end of the unipolar world era; and here the ideological component is important in terms of creating alternative ideological narratives: “Specific factors typical for the current global situation include rapid degradation of the US economic hegemony, economic slowdown of the European Union countries, and equally rapid economic rise of China, India and a number of other Asian countries” (Glazyev et al., 2019, p. 202).

The fifth main component is related to state regulation and emphasizes the issues of entrepreneurial activity and reproduction of capital and public interest. The issues of state regulation of the economy can be considered from the standpoint of new theoretical frameworks. One of them can be the Chinese concept of socialist market economy: “Competition between the communist and democratic varieties of the integral world economy will not be antagonistic. For example, the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative with its ideology of “common destiny of humankind” involves many countries with different political structures. Democratic EU countries are creating free trade

zones with communist Vietnam. Competitive landscape will be determined by the comparative efficiency of national governance systems, as all of them will face the challenges of a new technological paradigm” (Glazyev, 2022, p. 112).

The next microtheme is also related to the theme of liberal globalization, but in the context of international cooperation and social responsibility. It is important to understand that globalization schemes came from mainstream and standard textbooks, and here it is very important to see limitations of the modern ideology of international trade: “For almost two centuries, economists have been proving to policy makers that international trade is in many cases mutually beneficial. This thesis has moved from the pages of textbooks to the pages of the press and has become one of the central elements of globalization ideology. As it usually happens, the creators of the ideology themselves are well aware of its limitations. One of the most important achievements of modern international trade theory is the explanation of why and under what circumstances trade between countries turns out to be ineffective and requires regulation” (Polterovich, 2005, p. 15).

The seventh main component outlined the problem of administrative reform, regulation and executive power of the Russian Federation: “Russia has borrowed an ideology of administrative reform from those countries where the principles and technologies of standard business management are actively introduced into the work of state institutions. The ideology of a kind of ‘denationalization of power’ was chosen, stating that it is necessary, first, to give independent (though ‘state’) agencies freedom of action to dispose of state resources with an indirect regulatory role of the state and, second, to transfer into private hands all those functions of state bodies, which business finds it profitable to accept (outsourcing)” (Leksin, 2006, p. 114).

A common point of view regarding ideologies is to correlate the failure of developing strategies and conducting reforms based on ideological attitudes: “The failure of strategies is caused not only by flaws in economic science, but also by a complex system of their selection and implementation, where the interests of society, politicians and experts themselves collide. The dominant ideology regarding socio-economic transformations is a crucial element of this system” (Polterovich, 2022, p. 51).

The next microtheme reflects information technology and information economy development in the context of meeting needs, decision-making and production organization. The use of modern achievements of information technology can also acquire specific features due to different kinds of ideological factors: “We propose to use solidarity information economy as an economic component of the state ideology of Russia. The organizational and economic theory of Russia’s innovative development should be based on solidarity information economy” (Orlov, Reut, 2017, p. 532).

The ninth component is devoted to regional and spatial development of Russia. In this context, the ideological component is important primarily in terms of designing and promoting the regional development strategy: “Obviously, it is pointless to wonder retrospectively how ‘strategic’ is the decision to first produce the strategies of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation and then only the national strategy. This decision simply reflects the fact of methodological helplessness of yesterday’s ‘persecutors’ of the spatial aspect of the state economic policy. Now they have turned into the most zealous adherents of spatial ideology and spearheaded the official ‘turn to the regions’. It is quite reasonable, since this situation now produces quite good political and financial bonuses. But their methodological views still do not go beyond

macroeconomics textbooks, which makes it quite acceptable to understand the spatial socio-economic system as the distribution in space of a limited set of extremely aggregated and therefore already abstract macroeconomic indicators and generalized social features” (Minakir, 2016, p. 8).

The analysis of microthemes from the texts of leading Russian economists who explicitly use the concept of ideology allows us to identify important directions for further research, as well as the influence of the ideological component on the positive and normative aspects of development of economic science itself. Speaking about the ideological coloring of economic theory and economic policy, it is possible to encourage more active discussions among economists, which can lead to a beneficial effect through limiting the monopoly of dominant theoretical approaches and intensifying the competition of ideas.

Conclusion

Ideology plays its role in economic science. The world and domestic economic discourse have long been dominated by the view that “real” science is de-ideologized. However, historical experience of the evolution of economic orders and economic science itself has shown the significance of “mental models” as ideologems through which scientists and practitioners form positive and normative knowledge about economic processes and phenomena.

Representatives of heterodox trends in economic science more often talk about its ideological component in an explicit form. Thus, for example,

W. Coleman argues about anti-economics, which he associates with all the currents opposing the mainstream: “Anti-economics is not a reflection of the exceptional or anomalous; it is a conductor of modern history’s most powerful ideological charges; socialism, liberalism, nationalism, conservatism, radicalism, humanitarianism, and moralism. It is well represented among the rival wisdoms of our times; environmentalism, managerialism, feminism, and, emphatically, the convulsion against globalization” (Coleman, 2002, p. 4). Among leading Russian economists from our sample who explicitly use the concept of ideology, the majority³ can also be called representatives of various heterodox currents.

Economic science witnesses occasional ideological debates and even heated conflicts around several topics: the role of the state in the economy, the market and market mechanisms, economic inequality and economic development, regulation and deregulation of various spheres of economic life, individualism, collectivism, fairness, effectiveness, etc. Posing ideological questions in scientific research does not mean that it negatively affects adequate formulation of research tasks. In economic theory and policy it is impossible to eliminate the influence of fundamental paradigms, so the study of explicit ideological foundations of positive and normative components of economic science allows us to determine the influence of certain fundamental paradigms on them, as well as to intensify discussions between scientific schools.

³ Of the sample (21 economists), only 5 can be attributed to the mainstream and 16 to various kinds of heterodox currents in modern economic thought.

References

- Arthur W.B. (1989). Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events. *The Economic Journal*, 99(394), 116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2234208>
- Backhouse R.E. (2010). *The Puzzle of Modern Economics: Science or Ideology?* Cambridge University Press.
- Badie S. (2024). *Normative Economics in the History of Economic Thought: Marx, Mises, Friedman and Popper*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis.
- Balatsky E.V. (2020). “Institutional trap”: Both a productive concept and a fine metaphor. *Journal of Institutional Studies*, 12(3), 24–41. DOI: 10.17835/2076-6297.2020.12.3.024-041 (in Russian).
- Colander D. (2013). On the ideological migration of the economics laureates. *Scholarly Comments on Academic Economics*, 1(3), 240–254.
- Coleman W.O. (2002). *Economics and Its Enemies*. Palgrave Macmillan Books.
- Demicheva T.N. (2008). *Ideologiya i nauka (diskussii sovetskikh uchenykh serediny XX veka)* [Ideology and Science (Discussions of Soviet Scientists in the Middle of the 20th Century)]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya.
- Gieryn T.F. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: Strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 781–795.
- Glazyev S.Yu. (2014). Conservatism and the new economy. *Tetradi po konservatizmu*, 1, 61–69 (in Russian).
- Glazyev S.Yu. (2020). Noonomy as the forming linchpin for the new technological and world economic order. *Ekonomicheskoe vozrozhdenie Rossii= Economic Revival of Russia*, 2(64), 15–32 (in Russian).
- Glazyev S.Yu. (2022). Global transformations from the perspective of technological and economic world order change. *AlterEconomics*, 19(1), 93–115 (in Russian).
- Glazyev S.Yu. (2023) Technologies and sovereignty: Is the state in the grip of digital revolution? *Problemy natsional'noi strategii=National Strategy Issues*, 6(81), 60–75 (in Russian).
- Glazyev S.Yu., Aivazov A.E., Belikov V.A. (2019). Cyclic-wave theories of economic development and prospects of the world economy. Is the medium-term and long-term development of the world economy predictable? *Nauchnye trudy Vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva Rossii*, 219(5), 177–211 (in Russian).
- Gulbina N.I., Artibyakina T.Yu. (2015). Ideology and economics. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ekonomika*, 1(29), 31–41 (in Russian).
- Holcombe R.G., Hobbes T., Locke J., Rousseau J.J., Rawls J., Buchanan J.M. (2021). Contractarian ideology and the legitimacy of government. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 17(3), 379–391. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137420000521>
- Javdani M., Chang H.J. (2023). Who said or what said? Estimating ideological bias in views among economists. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 47(2), 309–339. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/CJE/BEAC071>
- Kirdina S.G. (2006). “The glory and the poverty” of political economy of socialism (institutional analysis hypothesis of the Russian society). *Zhurnal ekonomicheskoi teorii*, 2, 19–39 (in Russian).
- Kirdina-Chandler S.G. (2022). Economic theory, ideology, and economic interests. *AlterEconomics*, 19(1), 71–92 (in Russian).
- Leksin V.N. (2006). Administrative reform and public administration quality assessment. *Trudy Instituta sistemnogo analiza Rossiiskoi akademii nauk*, 22, 113–132 (in Russian).
- Leksin V.N. (2019). The roads that we do not choose (on the government “Strategy of spatial development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2025”). *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal*, 3, 3–24 (in Russian).
- Leksin V.N. (2023). Secret passages of the state ideology *Svobodnaya mysl'*, 5(1701), 147–158 (in Russian).
- Makarov V.L., Grebennikov V.G., Dementiev V.E., Ustyuzhanina E.V. (2019). Ideology and science (based on the discussion in CEMI RAS). *Rossiiskii ekonomicheskii zhurnal*, 4, 55–69 (in Russian).

- Minakir P.A. (2016). The national strategy of spatial development: Is it the conscientious delusion or deliberate simplification? *Prostranstvennaya ekonomika=Spatial Economics*, 3, 7–15 (in Russian).
- North D. (1997). *Instituty, institutsional'nye izmeneniya i funktsionirovanie ekonomiki* [Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance]. Moscow: Fond ekonomicheskoi knigi “Nachala”.
- North D. (2010). *Ponimanie protsessa ekonomicheskikh izmenenii* [Understanding the Process of Economic Change]. Moscow: Izd-vo GU VShE.
- North D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511808678
- North D.C. (1994). Economic performance through time. *The American Economic Review*, 84(3), 359–368.
- Nureev R.M., Orekhovskiy P.A. (2021). Debates around the basic production relationship in political economy of socialism: The cognitive deadlock in the 1970s. *Zhurnal ekonomicheskoi teorii=Russian Journal of Economic Theory*, 18(2), 185–196 (in Russian).
- Orlov A.I., Reut D.V. (2017). About the effect of the scale of an agro-industrial system on tasks and apparatus of controlling subsystems in its control system. *Politematicheskii setevoi elektronnyi nauchnyi zhurnal Kubanskogo gosudarstvennogo agrarnogo universiteta=Polythematic Online Scientific Journal of Kuban State Agrarian University*, 129(5), 532–562 (in Russian).
- Piketty T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology*. Harvard University Press.
- Polterovich V.M. (2005). Towards a manual for reformers: Some conclusions from the theory of economic reform. *Ekonomicheskaya nauka sovremennoi Rossii*, 1, 7–25 (in Russian).
- Polterovich V.M. (2008). Interviewing oneself (on the book by Janos Kornai “By the Strength of Thought. Nonordinary Recollections about One Intellectual Journey”). *Voprosy ekonomiki*, 5, 127–133 (in Russian).
- Polterovich V.M. (2017). Designing the strategies for socio-economic development: Science vs. ideology. *VTE*, 1, 55–65 (in Russian).
- Polterovich V.M. (2022). On the way to a general theory of socio-economic development: Towards the synthesis of two canons. *Voprosy teoreticheskoi ekonomiki*, 1, 48–57 (in Russian).
- Romer P.M. (2015). Mathiness in the theory of economic growth. *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 89–93. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20151066>
- Samuels W.J. (1992). *Ideology in Economics. Essays on the Methodology and Discourse of Economics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-12371-1_12
- Sedlachek T. (2017). Economics is similar to religion: It raises much more expectations than could fulfill (interview with Tomas Sedlacek). *Ekonomicheskaya politika=Economic Policy*, 12(4), 250–269 (in Russian).
- Shleifer A., Treisman D. (2004). A normal country. *Ekovest*, 4(1), 44–78 (in Russian).
- Sokolov M.M., Chechik E.A. (2022). Academic reputations of Russian economists and their scientometric estimates. *Voprosy ekonomiki*, 11, 117–135 (in Russian).
- Sugden R. (1986). *The Economics of Rights, Co-operation, and Welfare*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Volchik V.V. (2022). Increasing return and Russian innovation system. *Upravlenie nauko: teoriya i praktika=Science Management: Theory and Practice*, 4(4), 88–116 (in Russian).
- Volkonsky V.A. (2024). On ideologies and their bearers: Revisiting the issue. *Ekonomicheskie i sotsial'nye peremeny: fakty, tendentsii, prognoz=Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast*, 17(1), 41–59. DOI: 10.15838/esc.2024.1.91.2 (in Russian).
- Weber I.M. (2021). *How China Escaped Shock Therapy: The Market Reform Debate*. Routledge.
- Yun J.J. (2022). About Capital and Ideology by Thomas Piketty. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(2), 76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/JOITMC8020076>

Information about the Authors

Vyacheslav V. Volchik – Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Professor, head of department, Southern Federal University (105/42, Bolshaya Sadovaya Street, Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russian Federation; e-mail: volchik@sfedu.ru)

Elena V. Maslyukova – Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Associate Professor, head of department, Southern Federal University (105/42, Bolshaya Sadovaya Street, Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russian Federation; e-mail: maslyukova@sfedu.ru)

Received July 10, 2024.