

# Economics and Political economy textbooks: 28 years of interaction

*Nikolai Privalov*<sup>1</sup>, and *Svetlana Privalova*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Emperor Alexander I St.Petersburg State transport University, Economics Department, Saint Petersburg, Russia

**Abstract.** The article analyzes the methodology of modern economic theory. The advantages and disadvantages Of the McConnell and brew economies are analyzed. It is compared with the textbook "Political economy" of the period of the USSR and Soviet Russia. A literature review has shown that many authors are critical of Main stream and are looking for alternative theories and methodologies. The article analyzes the institutional reasons for teaching Economics. Given the growing global crisis of industrial civilization and, in particular, the systemic crisis of its economic and political leader-the United States, the question is raised about the need to create a new type of textbook on economic theory. The article describes the philosophical roots of Economics and Marxist political economy. According to the authors of the article, these two areas of science and education in the twentieth century became examples of a "secular form of religion", since their ideological orientation prevailed over the scientific content. "Russian Economics" is a textbook for undergraduates that has broader system relationships with other Sciences (sociology, political science, Cybernetics, zoopsychology, etc.) and applies, along with well-known models of Economics, also qualitative methods and models of classical political economy within the framework of a systematic approach. The article describes the methodological principles of a new type of textbook that reflect the basic provisions of traditional European culture and can serve to form the concept of the "third way economy", as an objectively emerging model of a mixed economy.

## 1 Introduction

Consider international publications on the Main stream methodology or Economics. Main stream is criticized for a purely mechanical approach to understanding social and economic phenomena [1]; for formalism, expressed in the predominance of the use of "obedient" models [2]; for similarity to physics [3]; ignoring the question of distribution, which avoids the ethical question of social justice [4]; ignoring the endogeneity of distortions in transition economies [5]; for adherence to economic imperialism, zeal to export narrow concepts of rationality [6]; contradictions in methodologies - especially those related to postmodernism, positivism and philosophical realism, in the traditions of thinking that have emerged since the Enlightenment [7], the inability to interact with criticism and alternatives [8].

Only a pluralistic economy is scientifically rigorous, honest and fruitful, according to S. Kesting [9].

The article by M. Huhn takes a fresh look at two essays by Adam Smith, who explains his social constructivist philosophy of science, i.e. proclaims the need for moral behavior and humility in a socially developed individual [10].

R. Kapeliushnikov discusses several embodiments of the basic axiom of liberalism - Homo oeconomicus: the traditional ("narrow") version, the extended (Becker) version, in behavioral Economics, neuroeconomics, and genoeconomics [11].

In search of a methodology that is adequate to the new economic reality, the authors turn to various methodologies that are alternative to the Main stream [12].

In particular, it is proposed to pay more attention to qualitative methods [13], to search for methods at the intersection of Economics and other Sciences - the theory of cultural dimensions of Hofstede [14], marketing, management, statistics and mathematics [15], sociology [16], institutional sociology [17], metaphysics of Economics [18], ethics (by returning to the pyramid of corporate social responsibility of Carroll) [19] and others [20, 21], in particular, using agent-oriented models [22].

A possible synthesis of behavioral and neoclassical Economics is investigated, the nature of which is clearly behavioral [23].

A. Sindzinger tries to determine the differences between the Main stream methodology and "unorthodox" Economics, including in the works of other authors [24].

At the same time, there are questions of an adequate combination of various disciplines, justification of normative values necessary for sustainable development [25].

Many authors consider the methodology, theory and model alternative to the Main stream - AV-Stryi school of Economics [26]; "an auxiliary compound" modeling-based advances in computational trust management [27]; the old institutionalism in the form of historical, discursive and constructivist institutionalism, which, according to Vladimir Yefimov, is a *Slu-live* frame of social theory [28]; the theory of institutional balance as alternative micro-economic equilibrium [29]; the concept of "economy of learning", articulated by Bengt-ake Lundvall [30]; the system dynamics approach recommended by Kornai in 1971 (with its negation of the preference for the equilibrium state) [31]; geoeconomics [32].

Given that a significant part of economic phenomena reacts to a non-linear cause-and-effect relationship, interactions are proposed to be considered not at the micro-or macro-level, but at the meso-level. It is not desirable to isolate them from the environment, but they can be considered using simulation models [33].

Modern behavioral randomized controlled trials ignore the context and compositional effects and reflect the biases of those who conduct the assessment [34,35,36]. The results of studies are distorted due to the application of the principle of methodological individualism [37]. Therefore, in particular, cognitive science can improve the explanatory and predictive qualities of behavioral economic theories [38]. In the post-industrial phase of development, the moral dimension is reinforced by the knowledge-based economy, sustainability, and further development of the theory of corporate social responsibility [39].

It is necessary to take into account the achievements of the history of economic thought [40], in particular, the analysis of Weber and Schumpeter in the field of economic sociology [41].

Crisis processes (and attempts at compromise solutions) are now observed in neo-institutional and evolutionary theories. In particular, evolutionists intend to find unity with Neoclassicism by supplementing it with evolutionary thinking. D. Frolov sees the reasons for the crisis in the exhaustion of the potential of the neo-Darwinian paradigm as a source of analogies for studying economic and social evolution [42].

In General, it is necessary to form a new economic paradigm at the intersection of Sciences [43]. Therefore, we propose: the paradigm of ethicolological value creation [44], "eclectic paradigm" based on the new institutional economy [45].

The importance of ecological Economics is proclaimed [46, 47], which can contribute to sustainable development, structural efficiency and compatibility of the biosphere and the new digital world, social justice with a General reduction in the anthropogenic load on the biosphere [48].

Some authors recognize that the mainstream economy has already become more interdisciplinary [49]. Thus, J. Jhun found significant parallels between economic methodology and thermodynamics [50].

R. Kapeliushnikov expressed a pessimistic assessment that there is no triumph or crisis in modern Economics. The period of great theoretical ideas for it seems to have ended, as a new atheistic tendency is growing in it [51].

Few authors defend traditional principles and methods of Economics: they note a noticeable increase in quantitative research among economic historians over the past few years [52]. G. Soldatos and E. Varelas point out the importance of preserving the institutional nature of capitalism as a free enterprise and competitive system under government in the service of the private sector [53].

Still, many are critical of the Mainstream.

Socio-economic analysis uses significantly less formalism than Mainstream. Five different formal approaches are discussed regarding their adequacy for socio-economic analysis: matrix approach to social structure, institutional analysis and development structure, system dynamics, (evolutionary) game theory, and agent-based computational modeling [54].

By research G.Racko, studying the Mainstream of Economics leads students to an increase in the value of hedonism and power, and a decrease in the importance of purposefulness and universalism [55]. S. Puehringer and L. Baeuerle received empirical evidence of a loss of interest in the study of Economics, a lack of real orientation in economic education. They suggest applying a qualitative methodology and focusing on the student perspective of economic education [56], taking into account issues of ethics, moral reasoning, and social interactions [57, 58], since the nature of a human being is kindness, cooperation, and sharing [59]. Undermining the authority of Orthodox Economics makes it possible to include socio-economic ideas in the Business school curriculum [60, 61].

Few authors write about Marxist theory. For example, the author describes the thoughts of the philosopher Kornelius Castoriadis about economic methodology in the neoclassical and Marxist traditions, which he subjected to constructive criticism [62]. Oktay Mamedov raises the question of defining an "elementary particle" of Economics [63], similar to how Marx highlighted the significance of a commodity. He also analyzes the micro - and macro - levels of the economy and concludes that it is necessary to leave the positivist paradigm, which does not make a fundamental development between them [64]. In the article "the Third life" of political economy. Working..." he, being the coordinator of the International Association of political economy of the CIS and Baltic countries, describes the discussions at the second Congress of the Association in May 2015. The Congress noted that the education system in Russia in the post-Soviet period rightly turned away from the dogmatically contested "quasi-political economy", but this led to systemic "costs" for all social Sciences in Russia [65].

The article by R. Westra introduces the work of Roy Bhaskar in the UNO-Sekin tradition of Japanese Marxism [66]. Marxist political economy has significant methodological potential [67], since it is based on "dialectical historical materialism" [68]. A. Siqueira offers an explanation of the stable tradition of deduction and empirical realism in economics from a Marxist point of view [69]. E. Cheng suggests synthesizing the

methodology of Karl Marx and economics, creating an economic theory of five main components: ultramicroeconomics, microeconomics, mesoeconomics, macroeconomics, and the world economy [70].

## **2 Methods and materials**

When obtaining research results, we mainly used a systematic approach, methods of scientific abstraction, formal logic, dialectical-theoretical methods, the method of institutional analysis, and other economic methods.

## **3 Research result**

Discussions about the possibility of combining classical political economy and marginalism, which is the basis of Economics, in Russia began in the early twentieth century. In 1890, M. Tugan-Baranovsky wrote that the doctrine of marginal utility not only does not refute the theory of D. Ricardo and K. Marx, but that, "on the contrary, this theory, correctly understood, constitutes an unexpected confirmation of the doctrine of the value of these economists." Later, he formulated a law according to which the marginal utility of freely reproducible economic goods is proportional to their labor costs. This poly-economic formula became the basis of many studies of Russian mathematical economists (A. L. Lurie, N. A. Stolyarov, V. K. Dmitriev), and then was accepted by foreign researchers [71. P.191-192].

Already in the 90s of the XX century, simultaneously with the growth of market reforms in Russia, their criticism began, and accordingly, attempts to revive the old ideology in university teaching. One group of scientists who tried to revive Soviet political economy is the Tsagolov school, named after N. A. Tsagolov, author of the main Soviet textbook on political economy [72. P.106-114]. They critically evaluate Economics, offering to supplement it with political economy and revive the corresponding departments of A. A. Buzgalin [73], M. A. Korobeynikov [74].

S. V. Braginsky and Ya. A. Pevsner in their monograph in 1991 conducted a comparative analysis of classical political economy and neoclassical theory, finding they have a lot in common. For example, they consider that the theories of labor value and marginal utility are united by a more general neoclassical theory of equilibrium [75. P. 79].

In 2008, MSU published a collection on "Capital" and Economics. It contains the materials of the "round table", which worked during 1994-1997. The authors compare the common features and differences between Capital and Economics (both as a textbook and as a neoclassical direction in general). At the same time, V. V. Radaev [76], A. I. Moskovsky [77], N. M. Rozanova [78], K. A. Hubiev [79], T. A. Agapova [80], A.V. Sorokin [81] admit the possibility of their synthesis. The latter, for example, sees the possibility of convergence of Marx's theory as a fundamental science and Economics as an applied one on the basis of creating a "new theory of costs". Chekanskaya calls Economics a modern stage in the development of political economy, in fact, denying Marx's theory a place in its proposed structure of teaching economic theory at the Economics Department of Moscow state University [82].

Yu. V. Taranukha admits the possibility of only creating a third type of textbook, calling attempts to simply combine them "eclectic" [83]. Z. A. Grandberg rejects "fragmentary use of certain provisions of Marx's economic theory" in the general course of economic theory, where the course is based on Economics, believing that this distorts the true content of Marxist theory [84]. V. A. Frolov recognizes the fact of the synthesis, but condemns it as erroneous [85].

In 2003, one of the issues of the journal "Questions of Economics" was almost entirely devoted to the discussion of the need to change the paradigm in the development of economic science. For example, L. Abalkin's article differs in its deep analysis [86].

The participants of the international conference "Political economy: reactualization of the classics and a new theory of social and economic development" in April 2010 in Moscow also noted the need to supplement the Economics with political economy [87].

V. M. Efimov argues about the crisis of modern economic science and believes that only institutionalism from the three directions of economic theory (classicism and Neoclassicism, Marxism and institutionalism) is not politically motivated [88].

In practice, in the early 90's in Russia, textbooks and manuals began to appear that combine Marxist positions and Economics to varying degrees: edited By V. V. Radaev [89], edited by A.V. Sidorovich and F. M. Volkov [90], textbook by V. D. Kamaev [91] and others.

#### *Characteristics of Marxist political economy.*

In the early 90-ies of the XX century, the world's most widely used textbook on economic theory was published in Russia for the first time. The creator of this type of textbook, Paul Samuelson, in his theory of "neoclassical synthesis", tried to combine the then prevailing theories of Keynesianism and Neoclassicism in the West [92, P. 274].

This was the time of the "Golden age" of capitalism, when the United States emerged from world war II with minimal losses and became the world's economic leader. With the creation of television and satellite communications, the promotion of the American way of life has become global. And now there was a popular textbook that began to promote the American way of life in the economy around the world.

The breakthrough into the educational space of the former socialist countries of Economics and other Western educational courses and textbooks was an ideological victory for capitalism. Thus, in Russia, the radical rejection of teaching the Marxist course of "Political economy" that existed all the years of Soviet power was carried out.

Political economy, which became a dogma and performed a political and ideological educational function rather than a scientific one in the XX century, had a number of significant shortcomings that objectively predetermined its fate at the stage of transition to a legal market economy:

-it lost the dialectical method, which was one of the main advantages of the theory of Karl Marx, since its main provisions, which were valid for the time of writing "Capital" (first of all, the existence of cruel exploitation of wage workers by the owners of capital), but lost their adequacy to the real situation in the early XX century, were preserved as a religious dogma. The need for creative development of Marxist economic science in relation to the new situation was ignored by the party leadership.

Similarly, the theories of "scientific communism" and Marxist-Leninist philosophy were based on the dogmas of "Capital", which reflected the conditions of pre-monopoly capitalism, as well as revisionist models of the social structure of V. Lenin and I. Stalin. Social science under socialism as a whole has lost its characteristic works of Karl Marx and F. Engels' dialectics and materialism. Dialectics was replaced by dogmatics, and materialism-voluntarism in the views of society and the role of the subjective factor in history;

- political economy was strictly limited by the framework of "economic determinism", which did not allow it to use the then existing achievements in sociology, psychology, Cybernetics, etc.;

-at the same time, the Stalinist-Leninist political economy did not sufficiently take into account the same fundamental principle – the principle of "economic determinism", which was violated by the introduction of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution into Marxist science. Marxist principle of primary economic development (basis) in relation to the

political superstructure in practice in Russia, it was replaced by the thesis that, allegedly, due to the prevailing circumstances (Russia is the weakest link in the chain of world imperialism), a group of armed revolutionaries can take political power into their own hands in order to "tighten" the underdeveloped (feudal) basis in Russia to a socialist superstructure. It is known that the Mensheviks, led by the oldest Marxist in Russia, G. Plekhanov, opposed this revision of Marxism and the October revolution committed by the Bolsheviks. They rightly judged that it is impossible to switch to socialism in Russia without a developed market and capitalist system, which was confirmed by the collapse of the socialist economy during perestroika.

Political economy was too politicized to the detriment of economic content. Moreover, it is one-sided politicized-with an exclusively Communist (Bolshevik) orientation.

*Characteristic of Economics.*

Subjective factors in the transition to teaching in universities and implementing the principles of Economics in practice were the defeat in September 1991 of the State Committee for emergency situations, the collapse of the USSR, the dissolution of the CPSU and the coming to power in Russia of the government of young reformers – supporters of market methods (E. Gaidar, G. Yavlinsky, A. Chubais, etc.).

To date, the practice of teaching Economics and conducting market reforms in Russia has firsthand revealed the advantages and disadvantages of the Orthodox economic theory "Mainstream economics" that underlies them. The main methodological features of Economics and political economy are presented in the Table 1.

**Table 1.** The main features of the methodological system Economics, Marxist political economy and «Russian Economics».

	<b>Economics</b>	<b>Marxist political economy</b>	<b>«Russian Economics»</b>
<b>General scientific principles</b>			
Attitude to the main question of philosophy	In theory-ignoring, in practice-subjective idealism	In theory-materialism, in practice-subjective idealism	dualism
In the understanding of man (the anthropological principle)	Homo oeconomicus (a socio-biological entity aimed at profit)	Collectivist (a social being is a product of historical development)	Socio-spiritual-biological being
Relationship with nature	Nature is a source of resources for the economy	Nature is a source of resources for the economy	Man and society are natural parts of the natural system that must exist in certain niches and unbroken equilibrium connections with other natural objects
Recognition of the objectivity of the laws of nature	The recognition in practice of the laws functional character	The desire to explain natural laws through subjective Marxist philosophy	Recognition of laws that operate objectively
Recognized type of determinism in the development of society	Technical, economic and geographical	Technical and economic	providentialism
Attitude to the positivist paradigm	recognition	Actual recognition in practice	Recognition as a certain stage in the development of European-type science. Negation in the present existing conditions
Object of research	Sphere of economic (market) activity of people	The sphere of economic (including market) the activities of people	The sphere of economic (including market) the activities of people
Subject of research	Behavior of people in the	Production relations	Socio-spiritual and economic

	process of production, exchange and consumption of goods in a world of limited resources; the market sphere as a whole	between capitalist and socialist modes of production	relations between people in the economic sphere
Epistemological roots	Ideology of Protestantism, Judaism, dialectics, English classical political economy, mercantilism, ideas of the French Enlightenment	English classical political economy, German classical philosophy, French utopian socialism	Teachings of world religions, Thomism, traditional culture, dialectics, structural and functional analysis, institutionalism, practice of public self-government, social partnership, Economics of the non-profit sector, zoopsychology
Methods of proof	The practice of market competition, mathematical, falsificationism K.Popper, political expediency	Practice – criterion of truth, a reference to the authority of the political expediency	Practice-criterion of truth, other recognized scientific methods, reference to spiritual authority, system logic, compliance with accepted morality
<b>General economic principles</b>			
Recognition of a positive and normative economy	Both positive and normative economy are recognized	The normative economy is recognized first and foremost	The normative economy is recognized first and foremost
Attitude to methodological individualism	Confession	Negation, instead of it-holism	Denial. Recognition of holism as an important principle of personality formation along with the influence of biological nature and spiritual forces
Attitude to the market	Recognition of the market as an ideal economic mechanism	Denial of the market under socialism, ideal-planned economy	Recognition of the market as a limited form of economic mechanism requiring public regulation
Which phase of the reproductive cycle is considered the main one	The sphere of exchange (the market)	production	All phases are necessary and equal
Attitude to the state	State-night watchman	Dictatorship of the proletariat, ideally-stateless communism	Objectivity and necessity of state administration under the control of civil society
Attitude to competition	Competition in the pursuit of profit is the main means of economic development	Competition in the economy is possible only on the world market	Competition in the economy is one of the forms of competition inherent in nature and society, which needs social regulation
Attitude to economic growth	economic growth is the main goal of the economy	economic growth is the main economic means of moving towards communism	economic growth is useful, but may be limited by humanitarian factors
Ability to take into account the achievements of not economic Sciences	The achievements of mathematics, psychology, management, Cybernetics, and sociology are taken into account	The achievements of mathematics, control theory, partially physics and biology are taken into account	The achievements of various social and exact Sciences are taken into account in the framework of a systematic approach
Criteria for economic efficiency	Income, profit, profitability, etc. at the micro level, quality of life	Economic and political power of the state, the degree of approximation to the ideals of socialism and communism	Preservation of life, health, including spiritual, of people



<b>Basic methods</b>			
General scientific	Induction, deduction, analysis, synthesis, abstraction, from the general to the particular, etc.	Analysis, synthesis, abstraction, from general to particular, etc. Deduction is more than induction.	Induction and deduction are equivalent, analysis, synthesis, abstraction, from the general to the particular, etc.
Dialectical method	In theory, Yes. In practice, it is dogmatism that comes from the market ideology (mainstream), which has become a "secular form of religion"	In theory, Yes. In practice-dogmatism, coming from the socialist ideology, which has become a "secular form of religion"	Yes, combined with the conservatism inherent in morals and traditional religions
Quantitative method	Statistics and econometrics. The tradition of quantitative assessments in Western Europe dates back to the XIV century. In the modern education system, these are point-rating systems in the quality management system	K. Marx did not apply quantitative methods. In practice, the USSR began to apply, primarily for planning purposes	Quantitative methods are recognized, but not absolutized. It is necessary to combine them with qualitative methods, in particular, intuition

The methodological basis of Economics is the neoclassical theory, created in the end of the XIX century by the leader of the Cambridge school of Economics, Alfred Marshall. Marshall combined the theories of supply and demand created before him, the theories of marginal utility and marginal productivity, and the theory of factors of production, thereby synthesizing the principles of accounting for producer costs and consumer psychology into a single microeconomic theory of equilibrium price. Thus, a step was taken towards creating a more complex economic science than classical political economy, in the direction of reconciling the extremes of classical political economy and marginalism. Thus, the modern direction of economic science was created for that time, which more adequately reflects the market model of the industrial mode of production at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries.

Economics, as a textbook, is quite easy to learn. It clearly demonstrated the most typical situations and behavior of economic entities in the market of perfect competition on diagrams (graphs, tables). The introduction of issues related to the functioning of monopolized markets, state economic policy, the actions of trade unions, and consumers has made Economics a universal textbook on micro - and macroeconomics for colleges and universities around the world.

Nevertheless, both in Western science and outside of it, voices have become louder and louder criticizing the most typical shortcomings of Economics, which do not allow it to adequately reflect even the mixed model of the American economy, on the materials of which it was mainly created. Notable critics include D. Bell, J. Galbraith, and others. First of all, Economics describes only one of the national models of a mixed economy - the US economy. At the same time, it is presented as the ultimate truth that can be applied in any market country. Ideologically, it can be regarded as one of the ways to promote the "American way of life".

Secondly, Economics describes the behavior of market economy subjects as the embodiment of «homo economicus»- a reasonable, rational egoist, driven in the market by an "invisible hand" to create economic goods for the purpose of subsequent exchange and satisfaction of their individual needs. It is believed that economic actions have as their goal the maximization of income – especially profit. This is the main motive of market participants. Economics does not consider non-profit activities – such as charity, and ignores the functioning of non-market sectors of the economy, primarily the sector of non-profit (non-governmental) organizations.



Third, Economics does not take into account the peculiarities of national psychology and other geo-political realities of most of the world economy's functioning territory. Therefore, it is not adapted to those countries where it is taught in colleges and universities to bachelors as the main economic discipline.

Fourth, Economics suffers from excessive schematism, formalization, excessive abstractness, one-sided Economism and mathematization, avoiding the analysis of socio-political processes, for which it is criticized by Western scientists, in particular J. Galbraith [93. P. 6].

Economics presents its own schemes, abstracting from many factors. Thus, it is assumed that market participants interact most often in the market of perfect competition, which is not true. It is assumed in advance ("all other things being equal") that all participants in market transactions are rational in nature and behavior. Thus, a rational consumer should have the following list of qualities - first of all, he should know the quality, prices of goods, the general utility, the marginal utility that he can extract from each unit of the consumed good; navigate the market; know your needs well; do not go beyond your budget; spend money in such a way as to get maximum satisfaction, i.e. maximum overall utility. The consumer is like a computer, which must constantly count its expenses and income.

Leon Walras' theory of General equilibrium, based on similar principles, is used as one of the most important elements in Economics. Naturally, in reality, the situation in the markets (and in the economy as a whole, which includes not only the market sector) is much more complex and fluid than is allowed in Economics. Economics describes the economic situation statically, i.e. ignoring the dynamics and, above all, the cyclical development of economic systems.

The exaggeration of the principle of "economic determinism", especially in line with modern Liberalism leads to the neglect of the complex non-economic factors of modern society – spirits-term, political, social spheres, which in the end, again, reduces the effectiveness of state regulation of economy and provoke (or prevent them) devastating financial, cyclical, and as the former socialist countries – and systemic crises.

Most models of social science of the XIX-early XX centuries repeated simple interdependencies: capital and labor (in the form of constant and variable capital in the Marxian system; in the form of production function in neoclassical theory), supply and demand, the balance of power and trade. As closed systems based on opposites, they are very attractive analytically, but simplify a complex world. With the progress of science, we are no longer dealing with a small number of interdependent variables, but with the ordering of large numbers. The main intellectual and sociological problems of post-industrial society are the problems of "organized complexity" - managing large-scale systems with a huge number of interacting variables in order to achieve certain goals [93. P.37]. The disadvantage of the economized model is also the inability to distinguish between technological and institutional processes [93. P. 386]. The economized model is based on the assumption that the link where benefits and costs should be evaluated is individual satisfaction. This is an atomistic view of society, reflecting the widespread misconception that the total sum of private decisions constitutes a public decision. In contrast to the economized way of thinking, it is necessary to create a sociologized model of "public interest" [93. P.383-384]. We still consider a person as a source of public choice (and in such matters as planning the number of children or market preferences, it can really be considered as such), but in most issues that affect the distribution of resources or change the social appearance of the country, such a unit is a group of people or a government, and we do not have an adequate theory of public goods and social choice [93. P. 407]. This was the opinion of the famous American sociologist D. Bell.

A well-known critic of Mainstream Economics is J. Soros. The negative aspects of globalization make us look at the prevailing economic theories and political concepts based on them in a different way. "Human behavior," George Soros observes, " ... is easily influenced by theories... but in social, political, and economic matters, theories can be effective and yet not be effective... The search for truth ... forces us to recognize that social phenomena may be influenced by the theories that have been developed to explain them. As a result, the study of social phenomena can be motivated by goals other than the search for truth" [94. P.38-39].

Combining such ideologically divergent textbooks as Economics and Political economy, in our opinion, and creating a new, comprehensive one, is possible in the following areas and principles (Table):

1. Mutual addition and mutual enrichment of missing topics and educational models, for example, Economics does not disclose the issue of labor, its nature, social essence, etc. The concept of the factor "labor" is much poorer in content than Marx's theory of labor. Marx also has a developed theory of the commodity, reproduction, and the theory of money as a commodity. There are original theories of property and the state. At the same time, Economics has an original theory of consumer behavior, accounting for psychology, which is not present in Marxism;

2. Attracting the achievements of other Sciences in the framework of a systematic approach – sociology, Cybernetics, biology, quantum physics, zoopsychology, etc.;

3. In general, it is necessary to create a comprehensive methodology based on the outstanding achievements of well-known scientific theories – dialectics, institutionalism, structural and functional analysis, system theories, of course, based on the best models of microeconomics, macroeconomics, and political economy.

In the construction of the methodology, the initial principle can be taken as an anthropological one, that is, to create a paradigm, secondary principles and basic models based on the understanding of the essence of a person. This approach is a continuation of the historical tradition that defined the basic methodological principles of many social Sciences. For example, the liberal economy is based on the axiom of A. Smith about "economic man". All left-wing theories are based on the idea of man as a collectivist being. The creator of the general theory of systems, physician-biologist L. von Bertalanfi, rejected the understanding of the human body as an open system [95. P. 94]. Religious theories are based on the image of a person in the corresponding Holy Scripture. Thus, in Christianity, a person is described as an "image of God", a creature-a creation of God, a "servant of God", etc. Fascist theories grow largely out of racism, etc.

We propose to proceed from the understanding of man as a socio-spiritual-biological entity, i.e. to build a model of man, using the achievements of not only science and modern management practices, but also traditional cultures. From here, logically, we will overcome the antagonistic contradiction with the dogmatized paradigm of O. Conte's positivism and recognize the need for a new paradigm, for example, the paradigm of equilibrium: "the idea of restoring the balance of man with nature, society and God" [96. P. 373].

The economy in an equilibrium social system, according to the structural and functional analysis of T. Parsons, should perform the function of adaptation [97. P. 34]. And according to the theory of socio-cultural dynamics of P. Sorokin, a more complex and humane ideational culture should replace the modern sensual culture based on the market economy, the ideology of liberalism and permissiveness [98. P.811]. In the economy, this should correspond to a kind of post-market stage [99. P. 296]. Therefore, it can be called the "third way economy". The "third way economy" should not be built for the sake of the economy itself or the "bright future" under communism, and not for the sake of instant enrichment of some while ruining others, but for the sake of preserving the life, health, material and spiritual well-being of people right now.

Accordingly, the ideology of liberalism, which gave rise to a global crisis in many respects, requires its radical transformation, and in many cases, radical replacement with a different worldview.

Therefore, in the future, the education system will also undergo global changes. Along with mass e-education, which provides undergraduate education with minimal costs, an elite system of higher education should be formed based on old traditions, which gives not a functional, but a systemic vision of the world. Accordingly, new textbooks, such as Russian Economics, are also required

## 4 Conclusion

Thus, we come to the following conclusions:

1. A literature review has shown that many authors are critical of Mainstream and are looking for alternative theories and methodologies;

2. The change of the course of Political economy by Economics in Russia was natural. However, due to the need for accelerated social development in Russia, the Economics no longer meets the requirements of the time;

3. The analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of Political economy and Economics is necessary to develop recommendations for creating a new type of textbook, which is their dialectical synthesis at a new, post-market stage of economic development, taking into account all system relationships;

4. The balance paradigm and the anthropological principle (man as a socio-spiritual-biological being) logically follow the other elements of the methodology for building the textbook Russian Economics, presented in this article.

The main principles of the methodology of Russian Economics were previously described by the authors in monographs [100-103] and textbooks [96, 104].

## References

1. E. Scharfenaker, J. Yang, Maximum entropy economics. *EUROPEAN PHYSICAL JOURNAL-SPECIAL TOPICS*. 229 (9) (2020)
2. Y. Gao, Rethinking the Formalism-Substantivism Debate in Social Science: A Perspective from Recent Developments in Economic Methodology. *MODERN CHINA* (2020)
3. A. Bhide, Making economics more useful: how technological eclecticism could help. *APPLIED ECONOMICS*. 52 (26) (2020)
4. Z. Pogatsa, How Does the Methodology of Neoclassical Economics Eliminate the Question of Fairness? *ECONOMIC OBJECTS AND THE OBJECTS OF ECONOMICS. Virtues and Economics*. 3 (2018)
5. J. Lin, New structural economics: the third generation of development economics. *ASIAN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES*. 9 (3) (2020)
6. R. Sethi, Rationalizing Choice: A Review Essay on Peter Leeson's WTF?! : An Economic Tour of the Weird. *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC LITERATURE*. 57 (4) (2019)
7. B. Bowden, Empiricism, epistemology and modern postmodernism: a critique. *QUALITATIVE RESEARCH IN ORGANIZATIONS AND MANAGEMENT*. 14 (4) (2019)
8. B. Fine, Post-truth: an alumni economist's perspective. *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF APPLIED ECONOMICS* (2019)

9. S.Kesting, Rigor in Economics means Pluralism. *FORUM FOR SOCIAL ECONOMICS*. 48 (4) (2019)
10. M.Huhn, Adam Smith's Philosophy of Science: Economics as Moral Imagination. *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ETHICS*. 155 (1) (2019)
11. R.Kapeliushnikov, Who Is Homo Oeconomicus? *EKONOMICHESKAYA POLITIKA*. 15 (1) (2020)
12. R. Murphy, Economics is whatever the comparative advantage of economists is: a comment on Leeson. *JOURNAL OF INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMICS*. 16 (4) (2020)
13. C.Menard, Please, open the windows! *JOURNAL OF INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMICS*. 16 (4) (2020)
14. I.Mihai, I.Novo-Corti, A new insight into the methodology of cultural economics. *APPLIED ECONOMICS LETTERS* (2020)
15. M.Alghalith, New methods of modeling and estimating preferences. *STUDIES IN ECONOMICS AND FINANCE*. 36 (1) (2019)
16. N.Brisset, D.Jullien, The model (also) in the world: extending the sociological theory of fields to economic models. *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC METHODOLOGY*. 27 (2) (2020)
17. C. Hernandez, The fundamental theoretical convergence between the contributions from economists of the Neoclassical School and the institutionalisers of sociology. *CUADERNOS DE ECONOMIA-SPAIN*. 41 (115) (2018)
18. O. Petinova, "Homo Oeconomicus" Through the Lens of Metaphysics of Economics. *PHILOSOPHY AND COSMOLOGY-FILOSOFIYA I KOSMOLOGIYA*. 21(2018)
19. S.Wagner-Tsukamoto, In search of ethics: from Carroll to integrative CSR economics. *SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY JOURNAL*. 15 (4) (2019)
20. R.Sethi, Rationalizing Choice: A Review Essay on Peter Leeson's WTF?! : An Economic Tour of the Weird. *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC LITERATURE*. 57 (4) (2019)
21. A.Haldane, A.Turrell, Drawing on different disciplines: macroeconomic agent-based models. *JOURNAL OF EVOLUTIONARY ECONOMICS*. 29 (1) (2019)
22. A. Haldane , A. Turrell, An interdisciplinary model for macroeconomics. *OXFORD REVIEW OF ECONOMIC POLICY*. 34 (1-2) (2018)
23. E. Angner, We're all behavioral economists now. *JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC METHODOLOGY*. 26 (3) (2019)
24. A.Sindzingre, CAUSALITY, MODELLING, SOCIAL NORMS: AMONG THE THEORETICAL CORES OF 'HETERODOX' ECONOMICS? *JOURNAL OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES*. 10 (4) (2018)
25. C.Boda, T.Faran, Paradigm Found? Immanent Critique to Tackle Interdisciplinarity and Normativity in Science for Sustainable Development. *SUSTAINABILITY*. 10 (10) (2018)
26. P. Pieniaze, Austrian and Mainstream Economics: How Do They Differ? *EKONOMISTA*. 2
27. D.Trcek, COMPUTATIONAL TRUST MANAGEMENT IN ECONOMICS PHENOMENA RESEARCH. *TECHNOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF ECONOMY*. 24 (6) (2018)
28. P.Kondrashov, THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ORDER AND ECONOMISTS. *JOURNAL OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES*. 10 (1) (2018)

29. J.Wilkin, A.Kargol-Wasiluk, M.Zalesko, INSTITUTIONAL EQUILIBRIUM: THE FOUNDATION OF ECONOMIC EQUILIBRIUM. *EKONOMISTA*.6 (2019)
30. J.Cotsomitis, Is the learning economy a viable concept for understanding the modern economy? *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS*. 45 (3) (2018)
31. S.Keen, KORNAI AND ANTI-EQUILIBRIUM. *ACTA OECONOMICA*. 68 (2018)
32. Tumanyan, Y., Ishchenko-Padukova, O., Movchan, I. (2018) GEO- ECONOMICS IN INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH SYSTEM. *TERRA ECONOMICUS*. 16 (4)
33. A.Garcia, L.Ivarola, M.Szybisz, The paradigm of complexity in economics beyond laws and linear causality. *CINTA DE MOEBIO*. 61(2018)
34. J.-M.Servet, B. Tinel, The behavioral and neoliberal foundations of randomizations. *STRATEGIC CHANGE-BRIEFINGS IN ENTREPRENEURIAL FINANCE*. 29 (3) (2020)
35. D.W. Thomas, M. D. Thomas, Behavioral symmetry, rent seeking, and the Republic of Science. *PUBLIC CHOICE*. 183 (3-4) (2020)
36. A.Saltelli, L.Benini, S.Funtowicz, M.Kaiser, E. Reinert, J.P. van der Sluijs, The technique is never neutral. How methodological choices condition the generation of narratives for sustainability. *ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & POLICY*. 106 (2020)
37. I. H. Kvangraven, Impoverished economics? A critical assessment of the new gold standard. *WORLD DEVELOPMENT*.127 (2020)
38. S.Johnson, Toward a cognitive science of markets: economic agents as sense-makers. *ECONOMICS-THE OPEN ACCESS OPEN-ASSESSMENT E-JOURNAL*. 13 (2019)
39. R.Vilke, Towards holistic understanding of socially responsible provision of public goods: conceptual foundations. *SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY JOURNAL*. 15 (1) (2019)
40. D.Boegenhold, History of Economic Thought as an Analytic Tool: why Past Intellectual Ideas Must Be Acknowledged as Lighthouses for the Future. *INTERNATIONAL ADVANCES IN ECONOMIC RESEARCH*. 26 (1) (2020)
41. D.Aydin, I.Ozer-Imer, At the Crossroads of History and Theory: Weber, Schumpeter and Economic Sociology. *PANOECONOMICUS*. 66 (4) (2019)
42. D.Frolov, EVOLUTIONARY ECONOMICS AT THE PEAK AND IN CRISIS: PROSPECTS FOR THE NEW PARADIGM. *JOURNAL OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES*. 12 (1) (2020)
43. Y.Kotlyarevsky, A.Melnychenko, O.Ivanytska, E.Semenyuk, S.Kniaziev, O.Melnikov, NEW ECONOMY: EVOLUTION OF FORMS AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY. *SCIENCE AND INNOVATION*. 16 (1) (2020)
44. F.Glauner, Redefining economics: why shared value is not enough. *COMPETITIVENESS REVIEW*. 29 (5) (2019)
45. B.Silva-Rego, A.Figueira, New institutional economics: contributions to international business studies. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EMERGING MARKETS*. 14 (5) (2019)
46. Q. Couix, Natural resources in the theory of production: the Georgescu-Roegen/Daly versus Solow/Stiglitz controversy. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF THE HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT*. 26 (6) (2019)
47. I. Dzeraviah, Mainstream economics toolkit within the ecological economics framework. *ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS*. 148 (2018)

48. S.Kovalevsky, A.Falaleev, E.Gasanov, M.Konovalova, N.Reimer, On the Issues of the Structural Methodology of Sustainable Development. IVTH INTERNATIONAL INNOVATIVE MINING SYMPOSIUM. E3S Web of Conferences. 105 (2019)
49. B.Fine, Economics and Interdisciplinarity: One Step Forward, N Steps Back? REVISTA CRITICA DE CIENCIAS SOCIAIS. 119 (2019)
50. J.Jhun, What's the Point of Ceteris Paribus? or, How to Understand Supply and Demand Curves. PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE. 85 (2) (2018)
51. R.Kapeliushnikov, On current state of economics: Subjective semi-sociological observations. VOPROSY EKONOMIKI.5 (2018)
52. J.Edwards, Y.Giraud, C.Schinckus, A quantitative turn in the historiography of economics? JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC METHODOLOGY. 25 (4) (2018)
53. G.Soldatos, E. Varelas, Emotional intelligence in a neoclassical framework and the nature of capitalism. JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC STUDIES. 46 (1) (2019)
54. C.Graebner, Formal Approaches to Socio-economic Analysis-Past and Perspectives. FORUM FOR SOCIAL ECONOMICS. 47 (1) (2018)
55. G.Racko, The Values of Economics. JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ETHICS. 154 (1) (2019)
56. S.Puehringer, L.Baeuerle, What economics education is missing: the real world. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS. 46 (8) (2019)
57. T.Kopczewski, I.Okhrimenko, Can homo economicus be an altruist? A classroom experimental method. INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF ECONOMICS EDUCATION. 32 (2019)
58. C.Farias, F. Balardini, Teaching social economics Bringing the real world into the classroom and taking the classroom into the real world. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS. 46 (8) (2019)
59. I.Rafikov, E.Akhmetova, Scarcity in the age of abundance: paradox and remedies. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS AND SYSTEMS. 35 (1) (2019)
60. P.Manning, Behavioural economics and social economics: opportunities for an expanded curriculum. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS. 46 (8) (2019)
61. J.Wight, Antecedents to the crisis: Mandeville, Smith, and Keynes. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ECONOMICS. 46 (8) (2019)
62. A.Vouldis, Cornelius Castoriadis on the Scope and Content of Neoclassical and Marxian Economics. JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC ISSUES. 52 (3) (2018)
63. O.Mamedov, AN "ELEMENTARY PARTICLE" OF THE ECONOMY. TERRA ECONOMICUS. 16 (3) (2018)
64. Mamedov O. Makroekonomika Odnogo nedostatochno! // Terra economus. 2017. Tom 15, Vypusk 4. Str. 6-21
65. Mamedov O. «Tret'ya zhizn'» politicheskoy ekonomii, rabotayushchaya ... // Terra economus. 2015. Tom 13. Tom. 2. Str. 143-147
66. R. Westra, Roy Bhaskar's Critical Realism and the Social Science of Marxian Economics. REVIEW OF RADICAL POLITICAL ECONOMICS. 51 (3) (2019)
67. A.Buzgalin, "Capital" as the key to solving modern economic problems (Offline addition to the discussion on the revival of a special seminar on Karl Marx's "Capital"). VOPROSY EKONOMIKI. 6 (2019)



68. M. Pacifico, Dialectical-historical materialism: genesis and meanings of the method. ARGUMENTOS-REVISTA DE FILOSOFIA. 21 (2019)
69. A. M.Siqueira, CRITICAL REALISM AND THE ONTOLOGICAL CRITIQUE OF ECONOMICS METHODOLOGY. EPISTEMOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE-EPISTEMOLOGIYA I FILOSOFIYA NAUKI. 55 (3) (2018)
70. E.Cheng, PRINCIPLES AND PERSPECTIVES FOR A DIVERSIFIED RENEWAL IN THE SYSTEM OF MODERN POLITICAL ECONOMY. TERRA ECONOMICUS. 16 (4) (2018)
71. Vsemirnaya istoriya ekonomicheskoy mysli: v 6 t.- T.3.-M.: Mysl',1989.
72. Delenyan A.A. Vozmozhen li sintez marksizma i marzhinalizma??? «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodava-niya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S. 106-114
73. Buzgalin A.V. Klassicheskaya politekonomiya: vozvrashcheniye v universitety// Nauchnyye trudy Vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva Rossii. 2015. T.193. № 4. S.107-140
74. Korobeynikov M.A. Ekonomicheskaya teoriya v protsesse radikal'nykh peremen: vozvrashcheniye i osmysleniye sud'by politicheskoy eko-nomii// nauchnyye trudy Vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva Rossii. 2015. T.193. № S.171-179
75. Braginskiy S.V., Pevzner YA.A. Politicheskaya ekonomiya: diskussionnyye problemy, puti obnoveniya. M.: Mysl', 1991.
76. Radayev V.V. Klassika i neoklassika v politicheskoy ekonomii// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodava-niya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.76-92
77. Moskovskiy A.I. O sinteze ekonomicheskoy teorii K.Marksa i Ekonomiks// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.92=98
78. Rozanova N.M. «Kapital» K.Marksa i Ekonomiks: substituty ili komplementy??? «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.98-105
79. Khubiyev K.A. K sintezu osnovnykh napravleniy ekonomicheskoy teorii// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, pre-podavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S. 114-122
80. Agapova T.A. Preodolet' razryv mezhdru geneticheskoy i funktsional'noy storonami ekonomicheskoy teorii// «Kapital» i Ekono-miks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.124-132
81. Sorokin A.V. Sootnosheniye osnovnykh kategoriy ekonomicheskoy teorii K.Marksa i kategoriy Ekonomiks// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.189-220
82. Chekanskaya A.N. Ekonomicheskaya teoriya kak uchebnaya distsiplina// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepoda-vaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.183-186
83. Taranukha YU.V. Integratsiya ili eklektika??? «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsa.-M.: Ekonomicheskij fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.122-123



84. Grandberg Z.A. Sokhranit' prepodavaniye «Kapitala» K.Marksa// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsova.- M.: Ekonomicheskii fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.175
85. Frolov V.A. Politicheskaya ekonomiya – nauka o proizvodstvennykh otnosheniyakh// «Kapital» i Ekonomiks. Voprosy metodologii, teorii, prepodavaniya/ Pod red. V.N.Cherkovtsova.-M.: Ekonomicheskii fakul'tet, TEIS, 1998. S.176-182
86. Abalkin L. Ekonomicheskaya teoriya na puti k novoy paradigme// Voprosy ekonomiki. 1993 . № 1.
87. Politicheskaya ekonomiya: mesto v sisteme ekonomicheskikh nauk// Filosofiya khozyaystva. 2011. № 2(74). S. 265-296
88. Yefimov V. M. Ekonomicheskaya nauka pod voprosom: drugaya metodologiya, istoriya i issledovatel'skaya praktika. M. 2016
89. Politicheskaya ekonomiya // Pod red. V. V. Radayev. M. : Moskovskoye izdatel'stvo. OON-TA, 1992
90. Politicheskaya ekonomika: uchebnoye posobiye dlya uchiteley // Pod red. A. V. Sidorovicha, F. M. Volkova. M. : Izd-vo Mosk. OON-TA, 1993
91. Uchebnik po osnovam ekonomicheskoy teorii // Pod redaktsiyey V. D. Kamayeva i dr. : Izd-vo Vlados, MGTU im. Baumana, 1994
92. Seligmen B. Osnovnyye techeniya sovremennoy ekonomicheskoy mysli. - M. : Progress, 1968.
93. Bell D. Gryadushcheye postindustrial'noye obshchestvo. Opyt sotsial'nogo prognozirovaniya. - M. : Akademiya, 1999.
94. Soros Dzh. KH. Krizis mirovogo kapitalizma. - Moskva, 1999.
95. Privalov N. G., Privalova S. G. Metodologiya nauchnogo issledovaniya. Sankt-Peterburg: OOO «INSEI-otsenka», 2019.
96. Privalov N. G., Ekonomika nekommercheskogo sektora: uchebnik / N. G. Privalov.- 2-ye izd., Perepechatka. i dobavit'. - M. : INFRA-M, 2020.
97. Parsons T. O strukture sotsial'nykh deystviy. M. : Akademicheskii proyekt, 2002.
98. Sorokin P. Sotsial'naya i kul'turnaya dinamika/ P. Sorokin.- SPb.: Izd-vo Russkogo khristianskogo gumanitarnogo instituta, 2000.
99. Ivanitskiy V.P., Privalov N.G. Upravleniye strategicheskimi resursami kak funktsiya rossiyskogo gosudarstva// Ekonomika regio-na. 2016. T.12 (vyp.1). S.296-302
- 100.Privalov N.G., Semin A.N., Shaymardanov N.Z., Salchinskiy V.I., Stakheyeva L.M., Yusupov M.L. Sotsial'noye partnerstvo: ot rynka truda k grazhdanskomu obshchestvu. Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural.GSKHA, 2003
- 101.Privalov N.G. Ekonomika nekommercheskogo sektora. Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural.GSKHA, 2004
- 102.Privalov N.G. Ekonomicheskiye osnovy grazhdanskogo obshchestva: k novoy paradigme mirovogo razvitiya. Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo UrGEU, 2005
- 103.Privalov N.G. Tretiy put' Rossii: novaya nadezhda v XXI veke. Yekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Urala, 2012
- 104.Privalov N.G. Ekonomika nekommercheskogo sektora. Yekaterinburg - M. : Ural'skiy izdatel'skiy dom - Bol'shaya Medveditsa, 2009.